

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 09/911,602             | ORAVECZ, MICHAEL G. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Rose M Miller          | 2856                |  |

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Rose M Miller.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Jeff Salmon.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 9 December 2004
**Time:** morning
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*none*
**Claims discussed:**
*claims 62-85*
**Prior art documents discussed:**
*art filed w/ IDS of 11/29/04 & previously presented prior art*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed References lost by Office which were filed with IDS of 11/29/04. Had Applicant's representative fax and email copies of references so they could be considered and placed in Application. Discussed problems with newly submitted claims 62-74 as not being directed towards the elected invention. As Applicant wished to keep claims in single Application, discussed ways of amending claim 62 to form a linking claim which would allow rejoinder of the claims. Applicant's representative proposed an amendment which placed claim 62 in the format of a linking claim. As the update search did not result in art which could be applied and the previous rejections had been overcome, the Examiner placed the proposed Amendment into an Examiner's Amendment to place the application in condition for allowance..